

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

VERNON ADDISON

v.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, :
Office of Counsel

:

:

: Civil Action No. DKC 13-0846

:

:

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

On March 20, 2015, the court issued a memorandum opinion and order granting Defendant's motion to dismiss or, in the alternative, for summary judgment and entered judgment in favor of Defendant and against Plaintiff on claims of race and gender discrimination and retaliation under Title VII. (ECF Nos. 26 & 27). On April 6, 2015, Plaintiff filed a "request [for] reconsideration and vacate judgment." (ECF No. 28). The court construed the submission as a motion for reconsideration pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 59(e), and issued a memorandum opinion and order on April 13, 2015 denying the motion. (ECF No. 29).

On May 12, 2015, Plaintiff submitted a hand-written document labeled as a "response to memorandum opinion and order." (ECF No. 30). To the extent that Plaintiff's submission is comprehensible and can be construed as a second request for reconsideration or supplement to his request for reconsideration, he has not established any grounds to warrant

reconsideration. Plaintiff spends many pages *again* recounting his dissatisfaction with his work environment, discussing the alleged attacks by his former coworker Tu Nguyen, and his disagreement with his ultimate termination. The motion for reconsideration is not a device that litigants may use to reargue issues that have already been argued, such as the case here. *See, e.g., Quhui Huang v. Culpepper*, Civ. Action No. DKC 10-0089, 2011 WL 1327351, at *2 (D.Md. Apr. 4, 2011) (denying a motion for reconsideration where "Plaintiff ha[d] submitted a rambling, forty-seven page memorandum, along with approximately two hundred pages of exhibits, in which she appears to seek to relitigate the merits of the prior motion to dismiss."). There must be an end to decision-making.

Accordingly, it is this 1st day of June, 2015, by the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, ORDERED that:

1. The response filed by Plaintiff Vernon Addison (ECF No. 30), construed as a second motion for reconsideration, BE, and the same hereby IS, DENIED; and

2. The clerk is directed to transmit copies of this Memorandum Opinion and Order directly to *pro se* Plaintiff and counsel for Defendant.

/s/
DEBORAH K. CHASANOW
United States District Judge